



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

POOR RELIEF IN THE UNITED STATES.

VIEW OF A GERMAN EXPERT.¹

I. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS.—LITERARY ACTIVITY.—THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHARITIES AND CORRECTION.—POLITICS IN POOR RELIEF.

THE American system of poor relief resembles that of Switzerland in the lack of unity of character. There is no national American poor law. The federal government regulates poor relief in the District of Columbia, which occupies an exceptional position; and it supervises immigration, and of late has sought to restrict the entrance of pauperized and defective persons. In times of extraordinary necessity Congress may give aid. The statistical offices of the union gather information relating to public relief and private charity in all the states. In general, poor relief is an affair of the forty-five states, which they administer either directly or through the local authorities of counties or townships. The five territories, large districts which have not yet attained the name and constitution of a state, stand provisionally under the direction of Congress.

In order to understand the development of the American poor-relief system, one must properly estimate the manifold conditions which have been developed in history along different economic lines. The reader should, as Henderson remarks, keep before his imagination a map of the United States, and hold steadily in mind the climatic, historic, and social differences; the striking contrasts between New England, the South, the fertile plain of the middle states, the vast prairies of the West, and the elevated mountain regions and fruitful valleys

¹Dr. E. Münsterberg's view of the German system has been published in the JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY (Vol. II, Nos. 4 and 5), and the present article is a translation of his contribution on "Das ausländische Armenwesen," in the *Schriften des deutschen Vereins für Armenpflege und Wohlthätigkeit*, 52. Heft, pp. 116-72. The author is at the head of the municipal department of poor relief in Berlin, and his judgment of American methods is worthy of consideration.—EDITOR.

and coast climate of the Pacific states. Quite as various as these conditions are the forms of public and private care of the poor; in the western states they are frequently in the first stages of evolution; in the old, the so-called New England states, they are already affected by the evils of older culture. On the other hand, it occurs that quite young cities are superior to older lands, because they have appropriated to their use the most recent devices in this field, while other regions cling to the ancient methods.

Literary activity, in the restricted sense, is in America full of life. The writings and reports upon poor relief and charity extend to neighboring fields of social philanthropy and to prison matters; a fact which is not entirely due to their inner relations, but goes with a situation in which the administration of prisons devolves upon related authorities. Thus Henderson, in his recent work, treats, in the second part, care of the dependents; in the third part, care of the defective and feeble-minded; while in the last part he offers an introduction to criminal sociology. Henderson belongs in the ranks of those best acquainted with American poor relief, so that his book gives reliable instruction in respect to the prevalent principles of American efforts to help the dependent. The method of presentation is somewhat different from that of German works, not altogether so profound and systematic, but more pervaded by a practical purpose, with a decided intention, not only to instruct, but also to inspire and to win practical helpers for the work.

A work laid out on a generous plan is entitled "American Philanthropy of the Nineteenth Century," which was begun in the *Charities Review* of May, 1900, and which presents the views of specialists in the different branches of poor relief. The first article treats the general assumptions of social care of the poor. It explains the causes of poverty and the efforts made in America to deal with it. Here it is interesting to notice how the efforts to relieve distress are fundamentally the same in all lands, and how the same causes lead to the same observations and the same methods of help. As causes of dependence the author

emphasizes ignorance, idleness, intemperance, shiftlessness, premature marriages, gambling, borrowing of pawnbrokers, and, finally, the countless benevolent agencies. An evil which we encounter in Germany is noticed by this writer—the increasing ease with which heads of families in great cities desert those dependent on them for support. He adds that it is surprising how often the deserted wife and mother manages to provide better for her family when she has no longer the man's weight on her neck. In the following divisions the author discusses the arrangements of public relief: the so-called *Quincy Report* of 1821 and the *Yates Report* of 1824, for the states of Massachusetts and New York, which were the occasion of a new tendency in relief methods, and which have led to a more individual treatment, akin to that of the Elberfeld system. In particular, the tendency to employ preventive measures and to improve the working of private charities through the later charity organization societies is brought into clear light. Brief presentations, suitable for manuals, are found in the articles of Peabody in the *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften* and of Henderson in Conrad's *Jahrbüchern für Nat.-Ök. und Statistik*.

That the desire for expert instruction is deeply felt may be shown by a glance at the recent journals, which either serve private and scientific ends or are published by state authorities as a part of their duties. The most important special journal is the monthly *Charities Review*, which is now issued in connection with *Charities*. The *National Bulletin of Charities and Correction* is the organ of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, and it seems to supplement the discussions of the conference and prepare the way for them. More will be said in connection with the later mention of the reports of the conference, of the state boards of supervision, and of the numerous benevolent societies and special forms of aid. An important source of information was furnished by the American department at the Paris Exposition, whose display in the field of poor relief and related philanthropies was arranged with unusual skill. Especially noteworthy were the fine photographs and plans of the numerous new hospitals.

The American National Conference of Charities and Correction sprang from the same motives as our German Verein für Armenpflege und Wohlthätigkeit. In the autumn of 1873, at the suggestion of F. B. Sanborn, then secretary of the American Social Science Association, several men came together who recognized the need of an annual conference on relief problems, and most of these persons were connected with the nine existing state boards. After some correspondence, with favorable replies, the first conference was held in New York in 1874, which had representatives from four boards and written communications from four others. Not many more than one hundred persons took part in that conference, and its report filled less than fifty pages. During the succeeding years this organization has been greatly developed and has become one of the most significant factors in American charity. In 1898 the twenty-fifth jubilee was celebrated in New York, the place of its origin, and the conference was welcomed by the highest state and municipal authorities. During these twenty-five years the activity of the conference has kept essentially in the same course. The object of the conference is to discuss problems in the field of charity, to give instruction, and to promote reforms. This purpose is served by the annual meetings, for which preparation is made, as with us, by printed reports.¹ In one respect there is an important difference in method, since the conference covers a wider field and includes a part of general social movements for betterment; and, the number of subjects being very large at each meeting, attention is not concentrated upon a few points, as with us. This is possible only by the establishment of sections, with quite special technical problems for treatment. Thus there exist eleven special committees, each of which devotes particular attention to a single branch of charity—as public poor relief, care of neglected and deserted children, organization of charities, etc. It is characteristic of American conditions that a special committee is appointed to handle the theme of political interference with poor relief (committee on politics in charitable and correctional affairs); and I shall touch this matter in more

¹ Only in part.—EDITOR.

detail farther on. Quite as characteristic is the custom of having a sermon from some preacher ("conference sermon"). It is intended, as the jubilee report of 1898 declares, to strengthen among all participants the fundamental idea that care of the poor and benevolence have a religious basis, and are never to be considered simply from a merely economic or philanthropic point of view. The sermons, which are printed in the reports of the conference, are free from all pious cant and ecclesiastical partisanship, and are earnest and thoughtful incentives to charitable work from a positively Christian foundation.

A very useful part of the plan is the annually repeated survey of events in the several states. In 1900 there were forty of these reports, so that only ten states and territories were not represented. In each report a brief statement is made of recent legislation and new methods. The number of the reports contained in the publications of the conference, including the *Bulletin*, is legion. In 1898 there were thorough discussions of the laws governing immigration and settlement, the management of medical relief and its abuses, and the care for crippled and feeble-minded children; and in 1899 (at Cincinnati) the organization of charities, public poor relief, prison reform, and care of neglected children were the central topics. The conference of 1900, which was held in Topeka, Kan., was occupied with degeneration in rural districts, with the housing problem in small cities, with care for the epileptics and feeble-minded. At the conference of last year, which was held in Washington, May 9-15, 1901, among other topics already mentioned, there was found upon the program the following: subsidies from public funds to private charities and their relations to each other, the activities of personal care of the poor, relief of families in their homes, when the importance of individual treatment and voluntary human devotion to the needy was warmly emphasized. In comparing the American conference with our German union, the question is forced upon our attention whether the custom there, of treating all subjects of relief each year, even if cursorily, is to be preferred to ours, in which every year only certain important subjects are selected, but these treated with all the

apparatus of literary, statistical, and practical materials. Without doubt, the American method leads to repetitions, and frequently to superficial considerations; still it must be acknowledged that certain topics must be frequently discussed in order to be noticed, and that in this way the advance gained from time to time is more distinctly exhibited. In this connection it is to be observed that exactly those elements which are conspicuous in the discussions of the German union, the representatives of cities, stand somewhat aloof from the American conference, while the members of the state boards of supervision and representatives of private charity participate in steadily increasing measure.

The influence of the conference on the development of American poor relief is undeniable; it enjoys today great respect, and has actually become the focus of all efforts which belong to this field. Directly or indirectly through its agency there have been organized conferences in the several states, of which at present there are eighteen. In the state of New York one such has of late been established. For the first time it held a session in November, 1900, and considered a number of important questions, among which were the value and importance of outdoor poor relief, the necessity and value of the settlement work, the care of adults in indoor relief, the care of children, and the feeble-minded. Worthy of notice in this report is the doubtless correct remark that no age can be compared with the present in reference to the most suitable care for the needy, especially in respect to social and preventive work. Other conferences have recently come into being in Kansas, Missouri, and Virginia.

On the whole, one receives from the poor relief and charity of the United States the impression of a living interest in the revival of personal care for the poor; more than in other lands is the social importance of a sound method emphasized. A fresh inspiration pervades the American efforts, as in their industrial and economic work they keep their eyes open in order to learn from every direction the best and the newest; and as they take care themselves to search for new ways, so they have in our field appropriated all the new inventions, and, especially in the care of

the sick and defective, have made great progress. Still all this is very unevenly developed, being depending on the initiative of strong personalities, and frequently also dependent on influences which have not the least to do with poor relief and beneficence. The so-called charity sport, which in America especially shows such unhappy growths, is not the greatest evil. Great riches suddenly acquired without corresponding social and intellectual culture are displayed in great gifts to purposes of welfare, especially to education, larger sums than in any other country, in order to obtain social consideration or to conceal the not always pure fountains of the riches. But they are always gifts which flow for the benefit of those who have inferior advantages, and therefore their origin is not so carefully scrutinized. Much worse is the influence of political tendencies in the administration of poor relief. It is confessedly an old complaint, and the reform of the civil service is an old demand of the Democratic¹ party. The object of this reform is to secure administrative officers, not merely from the henchmen and servants of the ruling political party without regard to their qualifications, and to retain the competent after each change of parties, and make their nomination dependent upon objective considerations of age, physical vigor, and desert, and the proof of capacity and efficiency by means of a regular trial. This is the so-called "merit system." In the administration of poor relief the merit system has been successfully introduced only in part; as a rule, it depends upon the discretion of the state and city administrations how they will fill the places; and while abuses are not always connected with the selection, they frequently occur. How serious an injury lies in this direction may be shown by the fact that the problem has been made an object of repeated discussions in the annual assemblies of the National Conference of Charities and Correction; for 1888, 1889, and 1900 detailed reports upon the matter were presented. In mentioning the conference which was held in Topeka in 1900, the *Bulletin of Charities and Correction* thought it could not better illustrate the desert of President Faulkner, of Minneapolis, than by the statement:

¹ Some Americans will question this claim.—EDITOR.

Faulkner is the only public officer in the state of Kansas who retained his position through three changes of administration. He seems to have enjoyed the equal confidence of Democrats, Republicans, and Populists. As secretary of the state board of supervision he made the most earnest efforts to protect the state institutions from the demoralizing influences which are connected with political machinations. As a rock he withstood all that was tainted with dishonesty.

Professor von Holst, the well-known historian and one of the best German masters of American relations, writes upon this point in his *Constitutional History of the United States*, à propos of a declaration of Senator Macy, that

The politician sees nothing wrong in the custom according to which the spoils belong to the victor. . . . This custom has remained the principle of American politics, and it is a proof of the astounding vitality of the American people and of the unsurpassed advantages of its natural conditions of life that the state has not been crushed under this accursed burden.

The reports of the National Conference are offered by respected and independent men, among whom one no less important than Carl Schurz. The fact of the corrupting influence of political machinations and the necessity of extending the civil-service reform to poor relief are generally acknowledged. Schurz marks the character of the political spoils system when he says that the higher and the subordinate officials are promoted, not because of their intellectual or moral qualities, but because they have either already rendered good service to the party leaders, or because they are thus encouraged to render such services to the party or its leaders in the future. In the reports are found numerous examples of such appointments. That only a small part of the abuses come to light lies in the nature of the case and is expressly brought out in various places. It is reported of the Washington state penitentiary in Walla Walla that as soon as another party came into control a clean sweep was made of the officials. The same thing is true of the state prisons in Nashville and in Colorado. To the report is added the remark: "To the victor belong the spoils." In Illinois Governor Altgeld took upon himself, as the report of Swift expresses it, this shameful task, and the succeeding governor, Tanner, followed him in this course. We hear the same story about

Kentucky. In respect to the state prison of Kansas the report says that it is customary to make the change as quickly as possible, the control of supervision being regarded as simply a question of political power. The asylum for the insane in Topeka is cited as an illustration of the worst consequences of the system. There the supervising official declared, upon offering his resignation, that he could no longer endure the vicious situation which came to light with the change of officials appointed on political grounds. As an example, he says that the superintendent of the institution leads a dissolute life, and that the other members held a banquet in the drug store. One of the physicians is continually playing cards, another is ignorant, untrained, and immoral, and his assistants are frequently drunk. To the complaint of the chief official, however, the reply was always an admonition to hold his mouth, in order not to arouse the displeasure of those concerned, and thereby do the party damage. In the Marion county house, in Indianapolis, there had been a careful inspection of the institution, as was alleged, and it found an admirable condition of affairs. A few days later the superior officer was arrested for theft of public money. An investigation by the state board was in entire contradiction to that report. From Washington (state) it is said that in 1897, when the Populistic party came into power, at once old and experienced officers were removed and funds were allowed to meet political obligations. Even the school became a part of this political machine. Here we have to do, not only with questions of power, that is, with the satisfaction of holding the public institutions in the grip of the ruling party, but frequently also with very real rewards, which consist in appointments to remunerative positions, and which can be made especially useful by furnishing large contracts to party friends. On this point also the reports give various examples. Schurz mentions, besides provision of official places for partisans, before all the giving out of contracts for goods, buildings, repairs, and the like.

The consequences of the system become apparent in the defective administration, in the misdirection, if not in the faithless expenditure, of public moneys, as well as in the fact that

the better elements of voluntary officials, upon which the administration of poor relief is particularly dependent, draw back from these affairs. In a report of the state board of Ohio we read on this point :

So general is the disposition to apply the control of state institutions as a means of party advantage, or to consider it as a reward for services rendered to the party, that many of the best citizens, who in their civil affairs, social relations, and duties to the church are respectable and upright men, subject themselves to party decisions without seeking explanation, and join themselves to the unscrupulous members of the party in the occupation of the rights and interests of state officers to the injury of the state business.

The endeavors to put an end to this situation are very earnest, and up to the present time in a measure successful. Swift declares that there are many institutions which are free from every machination of this kind. Of the state prison in Minnesota he says :

The question of politics is never raised, and in the case of successful nominations the political connection of the candidate remains entirely unknown.

Of the state hospital in Toledo it is reported that it remains as free from politics as if it were a private corporation ; and the same is said of the asylum for the insane at Danvers and of many others.

The authors of the reports and those who took part in their discussion are in general agreed as to the ways in which the reform of the evil condition is to be reached. These are the enlightenment of public opinion, the establishment of an administrative body to which shall be appointed the best and most capable candidates on the ground of an examination ; and these shall remain in their positions even after changes of political leadership. The establishment of state boards of supervision, which shall also remain untouched by political changes, is recommended. The public opinion does not seem to be blind to the need of such improvements ; although Schurz rightly insists that public excitement of this kind is usually of short duration, and that only decisive legal regulations, in which public opinion is crystallized, can work permanent amelioration ; and to this end he favors before all the extension of civil-service reform to the

establishments of poor relief, and emphasizes the fact that no system can be too exacting in the effort to secure for itself the best ability. Schurz closes his fine address with the following words :

I give expression to the hope that the conference will not slacken its efforts to disturb the customary quiet by lively agitation, until the best and most skilful, and also those who, without being the best and most skilful, will have enough conscience to cease standing passively in the presence of the existing system ; until every man and every woman in the land is taught to believe that hospitals are made to care for the sick, and asylums for the insane to heal those who are mentally diseased, and workhouses to discipline and improve those who shirk work, and not simply to feed a crowd of hungry spoils hunters ; until good citizens everywhere are found with honorable and patriotic disposition, who will call a lie a lie, and a corrupt politician a rascal, and sign such declarations with their names ; until every man who possesses a share of political power, whatever be his station, shall never be in doubt that he who delivers up the institutions of healing and correction to political spoils hunters, in the eyes of his fellow-citizens, is no better than one who robs a church.

The advance which these continued exhortations of independent men have brought about is undeniable.

II. STATE SUPERVISION.

Next to the reform of the civil service the most important means with which to combat corruption is the creation of state boards which are intrusted with the supervision of the arrangements for poor relief. This agency is not new and has already often been employed, although it has not always fulfilled its purpose, because the members of such boards are themselves open to partisan influences. At present especial pains are taken to give an independent position to the boards and to make them non-partisan in character, or at least bi-partisan, that is, with participation of both parties.

The first board of supervision was formed in 1863 in Massachusetts, and this, in 1867, was imitated in New York and Ohio. At this time twenty-five states have such boards, among which are some specialized boards for the different branches of relief. Thus of late in Massachusetts, in consequence of careful investigation of the condition of public institutions, the former board

of lunacy and charity has been replaced by three bodies: the state board of charity, the state board of insanity, and the state commission of prisons; and a similar arrangement is found in New York. The boards carry different titles, among which the most common are the state board of charity and corrections, or merely board of state charities; in Iowa, board of state institutions.

The duties of a board vary widely; most limit themselves to control of public state institutions; while some go farther and supervise also private charities, in which quality they have the authority to inspect institutions, to require reports of a uniform style, and to set aside abuses. The boards are divided with reference to methods of administration, according as they are honor offices or are conducted by paid officials. With the first kind, as can be readily understood from the account just given, goes independence of partisan influences, while the others can give themselves more professionally and thoroughly to their work, but are also more politically dependent.

Here belongs an interesting experiment of New York. There exists a state board of charities which essentially is conducted by unpaid officers, among whom all parties and denominations are represented. Governor Odell had planned a reorganization of the board whose central principle was the replacement of the former board by a commissioner and two state officials to be nominated by the governor; and from this reorganization he expected important economies. Against this plan almost unanimously the greater benevolent societies of New York in many assemblies have declared their opposition. That an effective oversight must be provided was denied by no one. The supervising board, however, must remain free from influences which might tend to demoralize the public benevolent institutions; such a demoralization would be the result of partisan domination. On the whole, experience had shown that such arrangements, when conducted only by professional officials, not only accomplished very little, but also administered affairs in a more expensive way. If the governor, therefore, had the purpose to secure greater economy, he would in fact secure the

opposite result. The saving by diminishing the number of members would be essentially a backward step in the activity of the board. The former state board has known how to maintain a strictly non-partisan attitude, and through more than thirty years of existence has held the public confidence. A commission like the one planned would be a creature of the state administration, which would make a non-partisan supervision impossible. In this connection it was mentioned that the members of the board, who had an appropriation of over six thousand dollars for their personal expenses, had actually used only twenty-five hundred dollars. The success of these efforts against the Odell bill is, at the time of writing this report, unknown to me. Recently (1899) a board has been constituted in the District of Columbia which is subject to the immediate administration of Congress, after the attempt of 1898 to introduce one had failed. The opposition proceeded from a private charitable society which feared that the erection of such a board would interfere with their immediate and successful applications to Congress. In 1900 a board of state aid and charities was founded in Maryland, under whose oversight were to be placed all public and private charitable institutions which received state aid; and here also the first bill at its introduction in 1898 was rejected. The Iowa state board of control, founded in 1898, is giving general satisfaction. In Indiana a legislative visiting committee was appointed in this year (1901) to investigate all public and private institutions so far as they receive public aid. The committee consists of three persons, of whom two belong to the house and one to the senate of the general assembly. Significant are the words of the law which declares that only such men can be members of the committee as are of approved character and business skill, and who are neither directly nor indirectly financially interested. They have regularly at a fixed time, before a session of the legislature, to prepare plans relating to appropriations. So far as I can see, the state board of charities, which has existed since 1889, is not affected by this law; so that the committee is simply a direct parliamentary commission. The committee must be bi-partisan, inasmuch as

only one member of a political party can belong to it. By a law of 1899, the administration of the prisons is placed on the same basis, so that only the administration of the state penitentiary remains under political control, a fact which was mentioned with regret in the last report of the board. In California a bill relating to the establishment of a state board was approved by both houses, and yet rejected by the governor's veto.

Of the reports of state boards those mentioned in the bibliography lie before me. The complaint, sometimes made by German writers, that the American material is difficult to obtain seems to me unfounded. In this connection I gratefully acknowledge that the materials, including voluminous reports, were sent to me on request, free of cost, and very promptly.

A current survey of the reports of the state boards and of new legislation is regularly published in the *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction*. The reports of the state boards are almost always prepared with great care, and furnish, especially on the statistical side, instructive views. The foreign reader naturally will not notice signs of the political corruption already mentioned, unless, as in the case of Indiana, the report calls attention to it. The most recent report from New York (1900) declares that the continual change of officers in the poorhouses is very harmful to public welfare, and that reform of the civil service applied to this department would be an important advance. This report is remarkable both for extent and contents, although the reading of it is attended with difficulty. In not fewer than three thick volumes, and in nearly 3,000 printed pages, the entire system of the charities of New York is presented. The second half of the first part contains a great array of statistics, the second volume a complete directory of all the charitable institutions in New York, with exact statement of the purpose, the seat of administration, the officers, receipts and expenses, etc. In the same volume they have printed the legal regulations of the state board and poor laws. The year 1899 was unusually fruitful in laws on these subjects; not fewer than one hundred bills, affecting poor relief directly or indirectly, were passed by the legislature; and the

report remarks that some of these bills, in the judgment of the board, will be found unconstitutional. The administrative activity of the board is extended to all the public and to many private institutions, some of great importance. The evidences of careful supervision appear everywhere; a special report being rendered for each institution. Of state institutions subject to supervision, twelve were named with a total population of 6,885 inmates and an expenditure of \$1,180,000; most of these being devoted to the care of defectives (blind, deaf-mutes, feeble-minded, etc.). Of private institutions which receive state aid, ten are mentioned with 3,228 inmates, and an expenditure of \$790,000, of which \$660,000 came from public funds. Here the institutions for deaf-mutes are conspicuous.

An event of very deep import must be mentioned which illustrates the danger which seriously threatens one of the most vital functions of the state board—the oversight of private charities. It has importance for the other American states and is of interest far beyond the American borders. The law relating to the state board contains in sec. iv the language:

To visit and inspect any charitable, eleemosynary, correctional, or reformatory institution in this state, excepting prisons, whether receiving state aid or maintained by municipalities or otherwise.

In these words the state board had regarded itself as authorized to inspect the working of all charitable arrangements. When the board desired, in 1899, to inspect the building of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, they were refused access on the ground that this society did not belong in the class of charitable institutions. The state board, proceeding from the belief that the society belonged in the highest sense of the word to benevolent institutions—and, by the way, it is really a very beneficent work—applied to the attorney-general in order to enforce its rights. Both parties appealed from the first decision, which suited neither of them, to the court, which unanimously supported the claim of the state board. Upon this the society appealed (on some ground), and then followed a decision of Judge O'Brien, to which three judges agreed and from which a minority of them dissented, to the effect that the society was

not a "charitable institution," was not under the supervision of the state board, and that their power extended only to such institutions as were partly or entirely supported by the state. This decision excited both anxiety and indignation in the state board and in the minds of many persons who are convinced of the necessity of rigorous state supervision. The state board gives detailed information in regard to the affair. In various places, as in the *Quarterly Record* (June, 1900) and in the *National Bulletin of Charities and Correction* (August, 1900), Homer Folks and W. R. Stewart discuss the matter thoroughly and explain the effect of the judicial decision. Stewart especially deals with the question of supervision in its historical development and theoretical and practical importance, with the help of the entire materials of the judicial decisions. The practical significance lies in the result that this declaration of the highest court must have as a consequence a complete change in the practice of the state board, and that many of the institutions which have hitherto submitted without objection to supervision must now be withdrawn. While the board at the end of 1899 had inspected over 1,200 benevolent agencies, from this time 663 must be withdrawn because they are supported simply from private means and perform no public function. Among these are 47 asylums, 74 homes for the aged, 35 institutions for children, 63 general hospitals, etc. The very useful statistics relating to all the institutions which have been published by the board must be abandoned. The board, in whose quarterly report this discussion appears, very naturally expresses deep regret at this turn in affairs, which must result in public injury. The argument is significant, not only for the New York administration, but in relation to public supervision generally.

As a matter of fact, the effects are already noticeable in the refusal of several societies to receive inspectors. In vain the state board sought in the year past by legal means to obtain aid. One bill was introduced with the special object of requiring inspection of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty, and another aimed in general to extend the rights and duties of the state board to benevolent agencies which received no public

subsidy, in cases where the state board had previously gained the consent of the administrators of these societies. Both these bills were defeated by the opposition of the president of the society already mentioned, while at the same time a new bill limited the right to supervise the State Home for Soldiers and Sailors. We must join the state board and its friends in expressing the hope that the decision of the highest court may be rendered harmless by the enactment of a law which will subject all charitable agencies to control. The sound societies have no occasion to shun the light of publicity, while the corrupt can be unmasked only by this means. In my report of 1898 I have given a very instructive example of this latter kind of charity, of which all lands have their share.

In very happy contrast with the attitude of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty is that of another great private society, the State Charities Aid Association of New York, which was founded in 1872 with the object of doing all that unselfish citizens can do to improve the administration of public institutions. To Germans it seems a very unusual proceeding to organize a private society to labor for the better administration of public institutions; it is explained by the peculiar American conditions. As a matter of fact, the influence of the society is considerable.

The poor law of the state of New York in sec. 30 grants the society particular authority to commission members to inspect all public institutions for the poor and the sick; such members must be residents of the locality of the institution. On the ground of this authorization the society, as appears in its last report, inspected the poorhouses and hospitals in forty-three of the sixty-one counties of the state. In addition it manifested a varied and far-reaching activity. It represented many public charitable societies before state and municipal authorities, and obtained for them repeatedly help from public means. It subjected legal proposals relating to benevolent societies to careful criticism, and by energetic oral and printed discussion contributed to the acceptance of desirable measures. It brought fifty-eight neglected children, who were a burden to

the city, under family care, and held them as those of earlier years under continuous oversight. Moved by an inquiry started in the city of New York touching city subsidies to benevolent societies, the society gave this question thorough study and made a detailed report upon it. Of especial interest is the activity of a commission which procures places in the country for mothers with their children, in order to prevent a great mortality of children, and also to develop in the mothers the feeling of responsibility for their children. The commission, which was established in June, 1893, had secured, September, 1899, in all 1,765 places. The report of the state board deals with the work of the society in detail, and heartily recognizes its service.

In order to characterize the tendency of state boards, I may refer to a remark in the report from Indiana, where it is said:

We have followed with eager interest all social problems which are in any way connected with pauperism, degeneration, and crime. We have zealously studied the causes of these social evils and the means to combat them.

To these labors may be credited the new poor law of 1899, which by experts is declared to be the most advanced legislation in this field.

III. PUBLIC POOR RELIEF.

Since the American relief system does not rest on a uniform law, as in England, it is left even more than in Switzerland to the legislative choice of the several states, in which, owing to the lack of a common historical development like that of Switzerland, and to the uncommonly dissimilar economic and social conditions, a very great unlikeness in the organization of poor relief is developed. The care of the poor is administered through the counties or towns or, in certain cases, immediately by the state. The organization of public poor relief on the neighborhood principle corresponds to the development in the older communities, where, as an outgrowth of the customs of the mother-country, self-government was an affair of local settlements, while in the territories settled by larger groups a wider community, the county, undertook the administration. There are also intermediate forms where obligation and

authority are suitably divided between the local and the state corporations. This appears especially in the obligation of the county to support those poor who belong to no town. In general there is a decisive tendency to recognize the peculiar needs of the cities, and to intrust to them the care of their own poor. Yet the city administrations suffer from the same influences as those of the state, although of late in the greater cities a change has been introduced. New York and Boston have completely reorganized their poor-relief system, while in Baltimore new ordinances went into effect in 1900. In general there is a strong tendency to take away from cities and counties the care for two classes of dependents, children and the insane. Several states have introduced an exclusively state system for unprotected children, and require that the insane be placed in state institutions. It is remarkable that the participation of the cities in the conferences already described is unimportant, but part of the fault must be charged to the circumstance that hitherto few subjects have been handled with special reference to municipal interests.¹ Accurate data are contained in a report which H. Folks made to the National Conference in 1898 upon municipal poor relief; reports on public charities from seventy-three American cities which in 1890 had more than forty thousand inhabitants are appended. The relation of the states to one another causes considerable difficulty because, as in Switzerland, the laws of the states are so unlike. In most of the states there exist settlement laws according to which a settlement or residence for a certain time obliges the township to provide relief. As a rule an unqualified residence for a certain time suffices; and this period in eleven western states is from one to six months, in nine states one year, in Virginia three years; while in some states, as in Connecticut, New York, Ohio, the condition of self-support, and in some states, as Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, the possession of property, is required. In ten states there is no requirement for settlement, while in two others it is merely necessary that the person concerned has come within the state boundary in order to receive public aid.

¹ This statement should be modified.—EDITOR.

Very strict regulations exist in relation to the removal of dependents. Persons without settlement are sent away as quickly as possible. Persons who receive aid outside of their settlement are generally relieved temporarily, and then sent back to the place of their settlement at the cost of the city or county.

The difficulties growing out of this situation, which increase with the extension of the means of transportation, and have occupied public thought frequently, have been in recent years repeatedly the topic of discussions in the National Conference. Reports in 1898 and 1899 were made, a part of which treated immigration from outside of America, while the other dealt with interstate migration and settlement in the relations of American states to one another. The prohibitions of immigration, which are exclusively the affair of Congress, and which date from an earlier period (1882 and 1885), exclude persons from entering America without means, as well as foreign laborers who go over under contract with employers. The movement against the admission of immigrants and in favor of widening the prohibition of immigration is closely connected with the burden of poor relief of the insane. A very unequal use seems to be made of existing laws. In his report of 1898 Sanborn investigates the problem with special reference to the insane. According to his view, which he supports with reliable figures, there is no doubt that immigrants have greatly contributed to the increasing number of the insane. Thus in Massachusetts during the last seventeen years (1880-97) the population grew from 1,780,000 to 2,580,000, the number of the insane from 3,168 to 6,547, which indicates a growth in the population of 45 per cent. and of 107 per cent. for the insane. Guenther opposes with great energy the recent tendency to limit immigration; especially he rejects the suggestion that the immigrants must pass an educational test. He says:

No one can desire more than I do that all elements which are dangerous to us should be excluded; but I do not say that a person physically and mentally sound and of good moral character should be refused admission to this land simply because he never had an opportunity to attend school. The

chief object of the agitation is to limit immigration, from a self-seeking and, on the whole, unjustifiable purpose of preventing the restriction of the American laborers' industrial advantage. The fact is overlooked that the newcomers are not only producers, but are also consumers. I am quite clear that the professional labor agitators are responsible for this crusade against immigration. Since they know no other means of keeping back friends, they imagine that the educational test will help them at least a little. If these people could do it, they would put an end to immigration altogether. Senators and representatives in Congress know how to use these people for their own ends, and when they preached the limitation of immigration they claimed that they did it for the glory of the people of the United States. They asserted that the law was not directed against the Germans and Scandinavians, and would scarcely touch the Irish, but they wished to exclude the Italians, the Russian Jews, and the Hungarians, since these are good for nothing and are corrupt. What do they care for these people, those who are neither Italians, Russian Jews, nor Hungarians? Such expressions are unworthy of a wise people. The people against whom these restrictions are aimed belong to the Caucasian race, which in religion, art, and science stands above all other peoples of the earth. There are good and bad Italians, good and bad Hungarians, good and bad Americans. Under present laws we can exclude all bad elements, whether they come from Germany, Sweden, Russia, or any other country; but I stand by this proposition, that a man is not proved to be bad because he cannot read or write.

The federal government, so far as I know, has not issued recent laws on the subject. There is a rising protectionist tendency in America, whose motto is "America for the Americans," a demand to which Guenther opposes the fact that the Americans themselves are a nation of immigrants. Garrett also refers in his report to this circumstance, and remarks with some sarcasm that the ancient inhabitants of America had a certain kind of race-feeling which was opposed to the immigration of undesirable elements, according to which the Germanic immigrants were contrasted with the Romance, and the latter regarded as the more capable and trustworthy. Garrett sees the danger, not in increased immigration, but in too facile naturalization, and thinks that this should be made more difficult and should be granted only after a certain period when the immigrant has obtained knowledge of the country and its customs.

Much more important for public poor relief is the question of interstate migration and settlement. On the ground of a

report made at New York the conference decided to establish a standing committee of seven members which should work for the introduction of uniform settlement laws for which there exists a real demand. The committee made a report on the subject the following year, and fixed upon the general outlines of a uniform law, the most important points of which are: agreement upon the period of residence necessary to obtain state and local settlements, the return of persons who do not belong to the community, and the creation of a board for the decision of mooted questions. On the whole, these propositions come near to the German system of legal settlement. One year of uninterrupted residence would lead to the gaining, and a year of uninterrupted absence to the loss, of settlement. Acceptance of relief, reception into a public institution, etc., are not to be reckoned in. Persons who in this way have not obtained the rights of residence in a locality, but who have remained a year in the state, are to be counted citizens of the county in which they have remained the longest time. Persons who have become a burden to the relief authorities and have no settlement are to be sent away as quickly as possible, and that to the state to which they belong according to the previous interpretation. The arrangement shall be made by state boards of supervision, although at this point a difficulty arises, since not half the states possess such boards, and even in these states the principle prevails: send away all you can, take none back. An interstate migration board, on the basis of a federal law, to decide points of doubt arising out of settlement laws, would be of great value. The realization of this desire, upon which the whole conference was agreed, although differences of judgment were expressed as to carrying it out in the present condition of the boards, will in any case be very difficult; since, as the committee admitted in its report, a federal law would be unconstitutional, because this matter undoubtedly belongs to the individual states.

The public poor relief, like that of England, rests upon the more or less exclusive application of the system of indoor relief. The poorhouses or almshouses are, as Warner calls them, "the charitable catch-all for the community." The laws exclude

public outdoor relief partly in cases of permanent dependence and entirely for able-bodied persons, so that only the sick, defective, and similar persons may be relieved temporarily by the outdoor method. Outdoor relief, for example, is abolished in many of the great cities, as New York, Brooklyn, Baltimore. The new law of Indiana for 1899, which the Indiana report boasts is the most advanced, greatly restricts outdoor relief. In the report the figures for 1895 and 1900 are compared. While in the former year \$630,189 were expended for outdoor relief, the expenditures for 1900, including medical relief, were only \$209,956, with a parallel decrease in the population of poor-houses.

This attitude of state relief is only intelligible when one considers that a richly developed private charity precisely in the field of outdoor relief comes to the aid of public relief, and that the effort to keep the care of children, the feeble-minded, the sick, and the defectives separate from other public poor relief is constantly gaining ground.

In reference to the first point, F. Almy has published a study in the *Charities Review* (1899, pp. 22 ff.) on the relation between private and public outdoor poor relief, in which he has brought together the facts about public and private outdoor relief in forty American cities. The figures are, as the author himself makes clear, not very satisfactory in relation to private charity, since a very great part of private charity cannot be represented in figures. Nevertheless the tables give an approximate representation of the importance of private charity, which always comes into relief where public outdoor charity is not employed or only in limited degree, as is seen particularly in Baltimore, New York, San Francisco, and St. Louis. In certain cities, as Boston, considerable expenditures from both sides nearly balance each other, while in others, as Cincinnati and New Orleans, expenditures for public poor relief, as well as for private charity, are described as unimportant. In some cities, as in Syracuse, public poor relief gives assistance in large measure, while private charity seems to be lacking. The figures seem to me not very reliable, since it is impossible that in ten of the forty

cities no private charity should be given and in ten others an inconsiderable sum. In these cases accurate information seems to have been lacking. At the same time, a certain interaction between the two factors is not to be denied.

Against the extension of legal outdoor relief the argument is often urged that it represses private benevolence, or at least makes its task appear less exigent. Among recognized authorities Dr. Walk, of Philadelphia, declares that no need has been felt in his city for restoring municipal outdoor relief, and that private benevolence was entirely adequate. Miss Richmond, of Baltimore, thinks that the anxiety about doing away with this system may be compared to the dread of bringing infants out of overheated rooms into the fresh air.

Wilson remarks in his report (National Conference, 1900) that he had made inquiries of many charity workers in smaller cities in order to learn their opinions and experience, and that almost all had expressed themselves as favorable to private outdoor relief, although some believed that they must defer the entire abolition of outdoor relief on account of the special circumstances of their community. Especially worthy of notice is his account of Tacoma, where relief from public means had been suspended, and where investigation and the menace of sending visitors caused many to decline further help from public poor relief. The incisive language of this part of the report is as follows:

Cut off from their supplies at the courthouse, the long procession which had received its monthly dole of alms from that source took up its march for this office. Great was its disappointment when we began to ask questions and to speak of sending visitors. Not a few were disgusted and flatly declared: "Well, if you're that particular, I guess we won't bother you." The upshot of the business was that scores at once went about doing what they would better have been doing long before, *i. e.*, taking care of themselves. \$150 a month easily took the place of the \$1,000 formerly paid, and with what advantage to the recipients you very well know.

A remark of Bailward seems to be significant also within limits for German relations. He says:

It is self-evident that in individual cases it is much cheaper to give anyone 2s. 6d. in outdoor relief than to support him in a poorhouse at 10s. a

week ; in the long run, however, nothing is dearer than this procedure. The more outdoor relief is applied, the more demand there will be, after a time, for indoor relief.

I have laid emphasis upon this remark, because in Germany also the facts again and again awaken similar reflections. Very often the American reports pay us the compliment of saying that our individualizing and honor-office system would admit of extended outdoor relief. In the last analysis the question of the right use of one or the other system, or of both in reciprocal relations, is, as Henderson rightly remarks, a question of practical administration whose success depends upon the value of its organs. The apprehension in respect to admission of legal outdoor relief is therefore doubtless connected with the conditions in the administration of relief, as I have described them above, and which, on the whole, justify the opinion: "Public agencies, as we know them, cannot individualize."

The subject was thoroughly discussed in the National Conference, May, 1901, in connection with the report of F. H. McLean, which treated the conditions in Montreal, where public relief is entirely wanting. It was argued that private charity alone is unable to fulfil the duties of poor relief, that it would even be demoralized and its principal task be neglected, if it were compelled to do that for which by its nature it is not suited. There was a decided tendency to favor public poor relief in all those cases in which a careful control of personal conduct is necessary, while private charity is better adapted to the cases in which free activity is possible. Fundamentally this is the principle of division which is actually made in Germany, although here the laws go much farther in the promotion of general poor relief. It is well worth noting, and is applicable to conditions outside America also, that private charity itself, where it conducts the entire business of poor relief, as in Montreal, may, quite as much as public relief, degenerate into unreflecting routine.

Still, we must acknowledge that the efforts to individualize in all forms of administration of public relief has made important advances in recent times. The condition here is similar to

that in England. Removal of children, the sick, and defectives from the poorhouses, better classification of those who remain in the poorhouses, according to character, are demands which have been strongly urged for American poorhouses, and partly carried out.

In a report which Alice N. Lincoln made to the National Conference in 1898 on the classification of paupers—in which, by the way, she spoke appreciative words of the Rummelsburg institution near Berlin—she made the claim that in poorhouses rewards for good conduct, and deprivations (not punishments) for bad, are admissible, and that earnest endeavors must be made to treat the poor as individuals, not as members of a class; that separate rooms for the inmates of different grades must be provided; and that the officers of poorhouses must be taken from a higher social grade. Similarly Byers, in his report on public poor relief (Conference, 1899, p. 115), makes prominent the deplorable mingling of different classes of the poor in the same house and the same rooms. In this field, almost without exception, the states show an actual advance; none of the reports which lie before me omit the mention of the ever-extending care for children and their removal from the poorhouses, and the erection of special hospitals, particularly for the insane and defectives. In the county poorhouses of the state of New York in 1899–1900 there were received 10,165 persons, of whom there were able-bodied 165, of sick and defectives 3,702, of feeble-minded and idiotic 556, blind 169, and children 133. Of the able-bodied only 177 men and 99 women were less than fifty years of age, of the sick and defective only 677. In the institutions of the city 58,399 persons were received, of whom 7,476 remained on October 1, 1899. Of these the able-bodied numbered 945, sick and feeble 5,139, and children less than 100. Of the 370 children mentioned in the tables nearly 300 were sent to children's hospitals. A comparison with the conditions of thirty years ago with those of the present reveals a distinct advance. In the New York report of 1900 this progress is expressly mentioned. The classification according to health is almost completely carried out, and while the former

poorhouse was described as a bedlam, as a school of vice, of crime, and of cruelty, the report calls the present poorhouses "homes in which the old, the feeble, and the unfortunate may pass the remainder of their days in peace and tolerable comfort." Thanks to the effort of the board, the administration has been improved throughout; especially the appointment of inspectors for examining the conditions of poorhouses has proved itself extremely useful. Also in Boston a law was passed during the past year by which the state board was authorized to inspect all the poorhouses of the state. The result is presented in numerous tables, in which similar tendencies to those in New York are set in clear light.

The question of relief of the unemployed, which is so closely related to the question of poorhouses, has also awakened lively interest among American administrators of poor relief; although, so far as I can see, they have not made marked advance in this field. Tramps in most of the states are treated as offenders and are sent to the prison, house of correction, or workhouse, or sometimes to the poorhouse. As a rule, they are required to work in return for accommodation; and sometimes punishments are added to labor. The length of the confinement is ordinarily fixed by the sentence. It is higher in the New England states and gradually diminishes toward the west and south, where the sentence seldom extends beyond ninety days. The punishment in the East is more severe than in the West, and yet the plague of beggars and tramps is by no means under control. For the unemployed in general, who do not belong to the class of professional tramps and beggars, the workhouse test—that is, the offer of support in return for labor—is declared by experts to be necessary in order to distinguish between those who are willing to work and the shirks. Washington Gladden in the conference report of 1899 (p. 141) discusses quite fully the problem, "What to Do with the Workless Man;" and he reaches principles similar to those which govern the German relief stations (*Naturalverpflegungsstationen*). Many friends of the movement in Germany will understand his pious ejaculation:

I have so often spoken of all these things, without making the slightest impression, that I sometimes feel myself tempted never to mention them again.

In a report on Ohio methods Byers relates that a new law requires every able-bodied man, who receives aid, to work for the public according to the amount received.

The work-test [thinks Byers], required by law, has a significance which cannot easily be estimated. Persons who will not perform the assigned task will be treated as vagrants. When they are compelled to labor in work-houses, the value of their work, after deducting the cost of support, is to be paid to their families.

As for the rest I may in this connection call attention to the book of Josiah Flynt, *Tramping with Tramps*, a very bright and lively study on tramps, among whom Flynt, in order to become acquainted with their customs and ways, has lived long and in many disguises.

IV. MEDICAL RELIEF.

In my report of 1898 I made brief mention of the hypertrophy of gratuitous medical relief in New York; that about 50 per cent. of the population received free medical treatment, and many places in the hospitals, especially for children, remained without occupants. That we here have to do not only with excess of charitable disposition to help, lies in the nature of the case, since the Americans, in spite of their often magnanimous benevolence, still are practical people who must have their reasons for admitting such abuses. The reasons become clear to the foreigner from a series of reports made to the National Conference in New York in 1898 upon this subject. There was unanimity in the opinion expressed that the hospitals and dispensaries had been multiplied out of all relation to the need of the sick poor. A series of circumstances has conspired to produce this superfluity of these institutions; first of all, the absence of plan in the furnishing of assistance so frequently observed in great cities, which in this field easily leads to abuses. The reports establish the fact that numerous patients receive treatment in the dispensaries and medicine gratuitously who are able to pay for both. Not even a cursory examination of the

facts of dependency is ordinarily made. From the side of the physicians there seems to be a mingling of gratuitous and paid practice, so that the dispensaries are a kind of decoy. Often there exists an unhappy partnership of physicians and druggists who seek to sell out worthless wares by this means. Another reason for the multiplication of these institutions is specialization; many physicians, in order to secure cases, open dispensaries for special diseases. The desire to obtain material is often given as the ground for the erection of hospitals. S. Wolf remarks, in his account of the situation in Pennsylvania, that in the hospitals which are established in connection with medical colleges the most serious offenses against the essential principles of medical relief may be observed. Once erected, in order to obtain clinical material for demonstrations, the greatest effort is made to make the number of cases handled appear to be imposing. The man who succeeded in keeping all the places filled with interesting cases is the one who is sought for a professorial position. The eagerness to make proselytes at the sickbed, not unknown in other lands, is given as a cause for establishing unnecessary institutions on the part of churches and sects. Very severe complaints were made against the conditions in the dispensaries and the clinics connected with the hospitals. Adults with consumption, children with diphtheria or with the first manifestations of scarlet fever, measles, etc., are frequently found in the great throngs of people in waiting, and they bring the germs of infectious diseases with them; while the waiting-rooms, as well as the operating-rooms themselves, are quite inadequate. For example, a dispensary which, according to its report, treats annually 48,000 patients, occupies a wooden shed twenty feet long, twelve feet wide, and eight feet high.

It is not possible [says Stephen Smith in his report] to invent a more ingenious arrangement for spreading all our contagious household diseases than that which is furnished by the dispensaries.

So also the qualifications of the pharmacists are frequently much in need of improvement, while the medicines are quite inferior in standard. The medical treatment itself, on account of its haste, leaves much to be desired; so that a result is

reached entirely at variance with the benevolent purpose of the institutions. The first stages of disease could not be carefully observed in the superficial inspection on account of the pressure of the throng.

In the larger cities almost all the medical societies, practical and scientific, and related organizations, have made thorough investigation of the means of correcting the abuses; among them the Medical Society of the County of New York, which appointed a special committee to investigate the problem and make definite proposals.

The plans suggested from many points of view were embodied in a bill which the state board of charities introduced in 1898, which obtained the approval of the legislature, but not of the executive. Then new propositions were made on which the New York State Medical Association, the New York Medical League, and various other representative bodies agreed. These propositions obtained the support of the commission of the senate on public health, but failed through the opposition of the chairman of the commission. It is characteristic that here again politics, or rather the fear of the interference of politics, played a part, since men were unwilling to have persons interested in politics give out written certificates to the sick. Finally an agreement was reached which led to the enactment of an important law, entitled "The Dispensary Law" (chap. 368 of *Laws of 1899*).

The law begins with a definition of a dispensary and describes it, so far as relates to the purpose of the law, as an institution conducted by a person, corporation, society, or administration, which solely or in connection with other purposes is designed to provide medical or surgical advice or treatment, medicines and appliances, to persons not resident therein, either gratuitously or for a return not proportioned to value; provided, that the means applied to this purpose are furnished from charity out of public means, or from persons who represent the institution or are immediately interested in it. This kind of dispensary requires a license from the state board of charities, which is granted after an examination of the matter, and the state board

is required to exercise supervision. The license may be withdrawn when reasonable grounds exist and public interest demands it. The withdrawal is to be brought before the higher court by the state board after a hearing has been secured for the dispensary. The dispensaries may not be conducted either in a drug store or a lodging house; nor may they display a sign which would give the impression that they have the official license. Violations are punished with a fine of from \$10 to \$250.

The state board has added administrative rules, among which those have the highest interest which relate to the proof of need. In every dispensary an officer is present, the registrar, whose duty it is to inquire carefully whether the applicant is needy. Very urgent cases may be admitted without a test. Where the need is in doubt, the first treatment may be permitted at once, yet only if the applicant signs a card in which he gives assurance in respect to his financial condition, and this is immediately investigated by the officer. Deception is punished with a fine of \$10 to \$250. Visitors with contagious diseases are excluded, and if they are found in the dispensary, measures are to be taken to isolate others and to refer the case itself to the board of health. Other humane and advanced regulations are, that in every dispensary a matron must be present, who is to care for cleanliness and order, and must be present at gynæcological examinations and operations; no examinations or operations of this nature may be undertaken without consent of the patient, or, in case of children, without the consent of the parents. Further arrangements must be made for seating all visitors in the dispensary and for separation of the sexes. The medicines can be prepared only by an apothecary authorized by the state law.

That the New York law meets reasonable demands is apparent, among other things, from the report of S. Wolf, of Philadelphia, where also the representatives of the physicians had agreed to propose a law similar to that of New York.

In this field of medical relief we notice an advanced movement which aims, like the one in England, to remove the sick and defective from workhouses (poorhouses) and to provide

special arrangements for them. First of all I may refer to the newly established Craig Colony for Epileptics in the state of New York. It was opened early in 1896, and has since received 530 epileptics ; at present it has about 400 inmates, and a capacity of 700. The importance of the institution lies in this, that it goes far beyond a mere place of detention, and makes possible a family life in groups similar to the well-known colony of Bodelschwingh in Bielefeld, Germany. On land in the country cottages are erected in which the inmates live like families. The grouping of the sick and careful observation of them receive special attention, which shows its effect in a remarkable diminution of the number and gravity of the attacks. The physical as well as the mental development is promoted. All kinds of work are carried on in the colony: school instruction, partly in evening schools, trade instruction, natural science studies, and occupations in handwork and gardening. Many recreations and entertainments are furnished, as lectures, concerts, sports, and celebrations of national and other festivals. The entire establishment is primarily designed for dependent persons of the state of New York, but pay patients are also admitted so far as there is room. The report of the state board (Vol. I, p. 243) expresses satisfaction with the results so far attained. Similar arrangements exist in Ohio and Massachusetts. In most of the other states epileptics are still sent to the almshouse. In May, 1901, was held the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the National Association of Institutions for the Feeble-Minded ; and there the separation of the epileptics from others who suffer from defects in the nervous system in special institutions or colonies, and a careful classification like that of New York, were approved. Similar views were expressed at the National Conference in 1901.

To the care of defectives, especially of children and youths, great attention and large means are devoted. In almost all states exist institutions for the instruction of deaf-mute and of blind children. These are either state institutions or private institutions, which are paid by the state for the care of children sent to them. This, for example, is the method for both deaf-mutes and blind children in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New

Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and for the deaf-mutes in Oklahoma and New York. Generally the institutions are designed for children of school age. The residence varies in duration, and is between two and six years, the former in Texas and Oregon, the latter in Alabama. In sixteen states a distinction is made between dependents and those who pay, but usually board and education are gratuitous. In addition to these special institutions there are also, in some of the larger cities, provision for the instruction of deaf-mute and blind children in the public schools, as, for example, in Pennsylvania, where school districts which have eight or more deaf-mutes among twenty thousand children must provide suitable instruction for them. In Wisconsin the state appropriates \$100 for each child of this class.

In contrast with institutions for the blind and deaf-mute children, there is inadequate provision for the adult blind, who, for the most part, if not otherwise supported, are sent to the poorhouse. Exceptions are found in Ohio and California. In Iowa, of late, a work place was erected for the blind, and its object is to give them occupation and to enable them to support themselves. In Maryland the institution for the juvenile blind is authorized to employ a part of the income of its funds for the erection of workrooms and places for the sale of wares made by the blind. In New York the conductors of the Institution for the Blind in Batavia are authorized to assist needy pupils in their occupations at state cost.

America has given special attention to the education and care of deaf-mutes. At present more than ten thousand deaf-mute children are sheltered in schools and homes, although by no means all such children enjoy this benefit. The Illinois report states that the great institution at Jacksonville has received during the last few years between 500 and 550 children, but that more deaf-mute children are growing up without any instruction than those who are taught. In the institutions themselves the best educational methods are employed, and a domestic life with work, entertainment, and recreative plays is provided. Especially for experts it is worthy of remark that instruction in sign language is gradually giving way to oral speech. A comparative

view shows that the first method was employed with 4,987 pupils in 1892, and only 3,992 at present, while the complete oral instruction was given to 4,451 in 1900, and to only 963 in 1892; and partial oral instruction shows a decrease from 3,282 to 1,848. The relative percentage, therefore, at present, is 49 for the sign language; oral instruction, 43; and partial oral instruction, 18. The Illinois school began in 1893 to emphasize oral instruction. This division has grown so that in 1900 it included 296 pupils, while those who received instruction in the sign system included 250 pupils.

In this connection especial attention is drawn to two works: *Histories of American Schools for the Deaf*, in three volumes, by Fay, which was prepared for the World's Fair of 1893, and contains reports, with numerous illustrations, on all American institutions; and the work of Fay, *Marriages of the Deaf in America*, which shows astonishing industry. It grew out of a proposition of Graham Bell, the celebrated inventor of the telephone, who deserves great honor for his service in the cause of deaf-mutes in America, and who established a fund for this purpose. The object of the investigation was to discover whether marriages of deaf persons contribute more than other marriages to the increase of deaf-mutes, and especially whether this is true in a higher degree when both parties are deaf than when only one is afflicted, and whether certain classes of the deaf are predisposed to have deaf children. The result is represented separately for each of the 4,471 persons counted. The principal result is that marriages of the deaf are more frequent in America than in Europe, and that marriages of deaf persons there have increased in an extraordinary degree, during the last ten years from 0.02 per cent. to 2.27 per cent. The increase is rightly ascribed to the establishment of numerous schools for deaf-mutes, which not only favor acquaintance of defective persons with one another, but also bring deaf-mutes into nearer relations with society in general, and so enable them to marry and rear a family. The majority of married deaf-mutes are married to the deaf, in the ratio of 72 to 28 compared to those who marry hearing persons. The marriages of the first kind run a happier

course than those of the second, among which the number of divorces is greater. Both works are to be strongly recommended to specialists, and the book of Fay relating to marriages contains, on p. 500, a complete bibliography of the subject.

The pamphlet on Helen Keller reports an almost incredible devotion, on the one side, and an extraordinary development of faculties in a defective child. This remarkable girl, who has frequently been discussed in literature relating to the deaf and the blind, although she is both blind and deaf, received a complete scientific education, on the ground of which she was admitted in 1899 to Radcliffe College. In this pamphlet one may read by what a vivid and immeasurably patient method this result, bordering on miracle, was reached.

For crippled children, more than three years ago, the Children's Aid Society, moved by the Guild for Crippled Children of the Poor, established day schools in which, in addition to elementary instruction, they learn a light handicraft (making cheap toys) and are enabled to earn something at home in their leisure hours. A convenient carriage takes the children to the school in the morning and returns them to their homes in the afternoon. In the school, in addition to the teacher who is trusted with the care of the sick, and with the kindergarten, there is a nurse who washes, massages, bandages, gives necessary care in dispensary or hospital, instructs the parents in methods of dealing with the children, and induces them to furnish necessary treatment. The advantage of this day school over the hospital, apart from the diminution in cost and the easier care for a large number of children, consists in this, that the interest in the children is not taken away from the parents, but they are induced to manifest even greater interest and love. At the beginning it was difficult for the society to bring the children together; the mothers were distrustful of everything that looked like a hospital; hard to persuade because they feared admonition or punishment for the neglect, or of refusal to apply the prescribed treatment. Thus the school in the first year had only twenty pupils, and it was with difficulty that the number was increased.

The school now numbers forty-five pupils and enjoys general confidence.

The rooms of the day school are two large instruction-rooms, a dining-room with adjoining kitchen, and a large clothes-room in which are found all necessary appliances for bathing, bandaging, massaging, etc. Benevolent ladies have undertaken to provide food and clothing; they meet the expenses required for beds, rolling chairs, carriages, and the like. On the seacoast they have established a summer home for convalescent children. Physicians occasionally visit the institution, and assist the teachers by their advice. How essential this kind of treatment is appears from the fact that the Children's Aid Society has established two other classes in different localities and projected two new schools. In this connection may be mentioned a law which authorizes the establishment of a state hospital for crippled children, with an appropriation of \$15,000. The report from Minnesota says that in 1897, when the first state hospital for crippled children was founded, the medical college of the state university was legally required for two years to treat the children gratuitously and care for them in every way; \$5,000 was set apart for each year. The members of the medical faculty thereupon made a contract with the hospital, according to the terms of which the care of the children, with the exception of medical treatment, was committed to a superintendent. The university paid for this service weekly \$3.75 for each child between two and twelve years of age, and \$4.50 for those between twelve and sixteen years. After an experience of two years this arrangement was voluntarily continued. The hospital set apart a building with thirty beds for the exclusive use of crippled children, which at present is so full that some patients must be sheltered in the central building. The state hospital for crippled children thus became an independent institution, for whose support \$16,000 were appropriated for the next two years. Since the opening of the hospital, in 1897, up to October, 1898, fifty-nine cases were treated, of whom twenty-five were greatly improved or altogether restored, while the others, with continued care, were on the road to health.

The movement for combating tuberculosis has made progress in America. The number of institutions thus far provided for dependent persons is not very great; the most important being the St. Joseph Hospital in New York, with 350 beds, and the Cook County Hospital in Dunning, Ill., with 380; two institutions, with 125 and 200 beds, in Massachusetts; one with 92 beds in Brooklyn; and one with 100 beds in Baltimore. Recently, May, 1901, was opened a second sanatorium of the Montefiore Home, with 100 places, which they hope to increase to 350, so that with the one earlier erected it can provide for 500 sufferers. The erection of new institutions has been decided upon this year in New Hampshire and New York, while in Connecticut a bill still awaits the action of legislature, but is certain of passing. In Pennsylvania the society for preventing tuberculosis has erected a sanatorium, while the legislature of Rhode Island has appointed a committee to consider the question. The Adirondack College Sanatorium of Dr. Trudeau occupies a peculiar position. It has published its fifteenth annual report, and Liebe, in his book on public hygiene, remarks that it must fill the German physicians in sanatoriums with a kind of envy. It is a colony in which from 250 to 300 invalids are annually received. The extension of the care of the sick by trained nurses, who, during three or four years, are thoroughly instructed in schools connected with hospitals, is very important. The work is satisfactory, and is by no means regarded as of little value, as in Germany so often happens. For this reason the free nurses compete very perceptibly with the deaconesses. At the same time the evangelical deaconess movement, after the German example of Kaiserswerth, has been considerably developed. The first real deaconess mother house is the Drexel Home in Philadelphia, founded in 1888, which belongs to the Kaiserswerth union of deaconess mother houses. The three Lutheran deaconess houses have united since 1896 in a yearly conference with the Swedish Lutheran deaconess house of Omaha and with the Norwegian Lutheran deaconess house of Minneapolis, and have over 175 sisters. The entire number of German deaconess houses in North America at the beginning of 1898 is

stated by Pastor Hortsch, of Cincinnati, to be 21 institutions, with 271 sisters, of whom 66 belong to the Drexel Home. Care of the sick is given in 23 hospitals, which had 7,215 patients. Other branches of deaconess work are orphanages, kindergartens, old people's homes, institutions for epileptics, etc.

I may in this connection call attention to an expression of Henderson in his new book, which is all the more worthy of mention since Henderson, a professor of sociology in the University of Chicago, himself belongs to the clerical profession. The remark applies to the German conditions as well as to the American. After he had considered the danger of increasing artificially in some measure the number of the poor by a too great extension of medical relief, he remarks that another evil accompanies philanthropic treatment of the sick like a shadow, that is, the employment of unsuitable persons by societies and city missions. He says:

There lies a real danger in the mingling of two duties, that is, reading the Bible and caring for the sick. Unfitness for the latter task must necessarily injure the cause of religion. If a deaconess loses a patient through forgetfulness in a critical moment, her zeal in making proselytes or in conversion will give increased occasion to antagonism to the church which she represents. It is both the duty and the interest of all religious societies to send out as nurses only those who are thoroughly trained and capable of assuming responsible activity in the sickroom. The physician will neither tolerate nor respect any other kind of nursing, and it is the physician alone who secures respect for the work of the nurses.

Another evil, of no less importance, is the overworking of the nurses in hospitals and in family nursing.

E. MÜNSTERBERG.

BERLIN, GERMANY.

[*To be concluded.*]